

directed to a system for performing association traversals including object wrappers associated with objects. Claim 21 corresponds to claim 1. Claim 26 corresponds to claim 6, Claim 29 corresponds to claim 11. Claims 32 and 33 correspond to claims 14 and 15, respectively. Claim 34 is directed to a method for tracking relationships between objects by at least determining a relationship between at least one object and a first association object. Claim 37 corresponds to claim 1. claim 42 corresponds to claim 6. Claim 45 corresponds to claim 9. Claim 46 corresponds to claim 10. Claim 47 corresponds to claim 11. Claims 50, 51, 52, and 53 correspond to claims 14, 15, 16, and 17, respectively. And, claim 54 corresponds to claim 34.

III. Conclusion

Applicants are not required to draft each claim with identical terms and phrases to avoid a restriction. A proper review of claims 1-56 shows that these claims are directed to a single invention with varying scopes. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the restriction of claims 1-56 as proposed in the Office Action dated October 31, 2003 and continue the examination of these claims as a single invention.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 25, 2003

By: 
Joseph E. Palys
Reg. No. 46,508

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com